

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 02-1786**

---

ALEMEYHU KENNO KASSA; ETSEGENET SHELEMU  
KASSAHUN,

Petitioners,

versus

U.S. IMMIGRATION & NATURALIZATION SERVICE;  
JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General for the United  
States of America,

Respondents.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration  
Appeals. (A70-677-418, A70-677-419)

---

Submitted: March 6, 2003

Decided: April 9, 2003

---

Before LUTTIG, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William O. SanFord, Silver Spring, Maryland, for Petitioners.  
Robert D. McCallum, Assistant Attorney General, Christopher C.  
Fuller, Senior Litigation Counsel, Brenda M. O'Malley, Office of  
Immigration Litigation, Civil Division, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF  
JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondents.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Alemeyhu Kenno Kassa and Etsegenet Shelemu Kassahun, husband and wife, and natives and citizens of Ethiopia, seek review of the decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") denying their motion to reconsider. The petition for review is untimely as to the March 21, 2002, order affirming the immigration judge's order denying their application for asylum and withholding of deportation. See Stone v. INS, 514 U.S. 386, 405-06 (1995).

The petition for review is timely as to the Board's denial of the motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and the Board's order and find that the Board did not abuse its discretion. See 8 C.F.R. § 3.2(b)(2) (2002); INS v. Doherty, 502 U.S. 314, 323-24 (1992); Yanez-Popp v. INS, 998 F.2d 231, 234 (4th Cir. 1993).

We deny as untimely the petition for review as to the Board's order of March 21, 2002. We deny the petition for review upon finding that the Board did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion for reconsideration. We deny the motion for summary affirmance. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED